

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-11, 31-50, 71-74 and 79-90 remain in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 32, 35, 39, 71- 74, 79- 83 and 85-87 have been amended. Claims 3, 12-30, 51-68, 70 and 71-78 were cancelled in a previous Office Action response.

Claims 32-38 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,374,241 (Lambert). The Examiner argues that Lambert discloses transmitting listee information, sponsor information, and framing information to the user for use in generating a display.

The Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly define the invention and distinguish the claims from the cited references. Claim 32 has been amended to add the limitations of receiving a search request from a user, and change the limitation of the transmitting step to URL information of a sponsor for displaying a pre-existing web page concurrently with the listing. A pre-existing web page is a pre-existing resource of information that is stored on a server and transmitted over the World Wide Web to computers through an Internet service provider prior to being requested. The applicant submits that Lambert does not disclose these limitations. More specifically, Lambert discloses a plurality of listings that are created in response to a search request. The displayed search results listings are therefore not a pre-existing web page. For these reasons, the applicant submits that claim 32 is not anticipated by Lambert. Claims 33-38 depend from claim 32 and are not anticipated by Lambert for these same reasons.

Claim 35 depends from claim 32 and was amended to include the limitation of providing a listee of the directory listing with the exclusive right to select a listee web page that is displayed with the directory listing and replaces the sponsor's web page. The applicant submits that Claim 35 is also not invalid as anticipated because this added exclusive right limitation is not disclosed or suggested by Lambert.

Claim 73 was amended to add the limitations of displaying the directory listing selected by the user concurrently with the associated sponsor's active and browseable pre-existing web page. For the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 32, the applicant submits that claim 73 is not invalid as anticipated by Lambert. Claim 74 depends from claim 73 and was amended to correspond to the terms of claim 73. The applicant submits that claim 74 is not invalid as anticipated by Lambert.

Claims 1-2, 71-72 and 79-81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,750, Verma. The Examiner argues that Lambert discloses the limitation “displaying the selected listing as a sponsoree listing and a designated active and browseable sponsor web page of a sponsor on the same page as the sponsoree listing in response to a user selection of one of the listings.”

The applicant has amended claim 1 to more clearly describe the claimed invention. The revised limitation require that each of the listings have a sponsor and displaying a directory listing selected by the user concurrently with the associated sponsor’s pre-existing web page. The limitation “each listing has an associated sponsor” requires that each of the listings has a sponsor that has purchased a listing sponsorship. The sponsor can be the listee or another entity that is not the listee. In contrast, there is no disclosure in the cited prior art of each of the listings having an associated sponsor.

There is also a substantial difference between a pre-existing web page and a plurality of listings that are displayed in response to a search request. The listing of results only provides links that can only be clicked on to obtain more information. Further, the listing is produced in response to the search request and is therefore not a pre-existing web page. The applicant submits that the cited prior art does not disclose or suggest all limitations of claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is not invalid as obvious over Lambert in view of Verma. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and for these same reasons, the applicant submits that claim 2 is not invalid as obvious over Lambert in view of Verma.

Like claim 1, claims 71, 72 and 79 were also amended to add the limitations of each of the directory listings has an associated sponsor and browseable pre-existing web page displayed concurrently with the listing. Claims 80 and 81 depend from claim 79. For the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, the applicant submits that claims 71, 72, 79, 80 and 81 are not invalid as obvious in over Lambert in view of Verma.

Claims 4-10, 31, 82-88 and 90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert and Verma and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,338,085 to Ramaswamy. The Examiner argues that Ramaswamy discloses a telephone activated web server providing a user interface for searching or requesting certain information. Claim 4 depends from claim 1. Claim 4 was amended to add the limitation of providing a listee of the directory listing with the exclusive right to select a listee web page that is independently and concurrently displayed with the directory listing and replaces the sponsor’s web page. The

applicant submits that none of the cited references including Ramaswamy disclose the exclusive rights claim limitation. Thus, claims 4 is are not invalid as obvious over Lambert, Verma and further in view of Ramaswamy.

Claims 5-10 and 31 depend from claim 1 and for the same reasons discussed above in claim 1, the applicant submits that Claim 31 is not invalid as obvious over Lambert, Verma and further in view of Ramaswamy.

Claim 82 depends from claim 79. Like claim 4, claim 82 was amended to add the limitation of providing a listee of the directory listing with the exclusive right to select a listee web page that is independently and concurrently displayed with the directory listing and replaces the sponsor's web page. For the same reasons discussed above in claim 4, the applicant submits that Claim 82 is not invalid as obvious in view of Lambert, Verma and Ramaswamy.

Claims 83-87 depend from claim 82 and for the same reasons discussed in claim 82, the applicant submits that claims 83-87 are not invalid as obvious over Lambert, Verma and Ramaswamy.

Claim 88 and 90 depends from claim 79 and for the same reasons discussed in claim 79, the applicant submits that claims 88 and 90 are not invalid as obvious in view of Lambert, Verma and Ramaswamy.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, Verma, Ramaswamy and further in view of Gupta, U.S. Patent No. 6,487,538. Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and includes the limitations that each of the listings has an associated sponsor and the directory listing selected by the user is displayed concurrently with the associated sponsor's active and browseable pre-existing web page. The applicant submits that these limitations are not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art. Thus, claim 11 is not invalid as obvious in view of the combination of Lambert, Verma, Ramaswamy and Gupta.

Claim 89 depends from claim 79 and was also rejected as being unpatentable over Lambert, Verma, Ramaswamy and Gupta. Claim 79 includes the limitations that each of the listings has an associated sponsor and the directory listing selected by the user is displayed concurrently with the associated sponsor's active and browseable pre-existing web page. The applicant submits that these limitations are not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art and that claim 89 is not invalid over Lambert, Verma and Ramaswamy in view of Gupta.

Claims 39-43 and 45-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,253,189, Feezell. Claims 39-43 and 45-50 depend from claim 32 which was amended to include the limitation of transmitting URL information of a sponsor for displaying a browseable pre-existing web page concurrently with the listing. The applicant submits that neither Lambert nor Freezell disclose the transmittal of URL information to a user for generating a browseable pre-existing web page. For the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 32, the applicant submits that claimed 39-43 and 45-50 are not invalid over Lambert in view of Feezell.

Claim 44 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,338,085 to Ramaswamy. Claim 44 depends from claim 32. As discussed above, claim 32 includes the limitations of transmitting URL information of a sponsor for displaying a browseable pre-existing web page concurrently with the listing. The applicant submits that neither Lambert nor Ramaswamy disclose the transmittal of URL information to a user for generating a browseable pre-existing web page. For these reasons the applicant submits that claim 44 is not invalid over Lambert in view of Ramaswamy.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the timely allowance of the pending claims. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 04-0822.

Respectfully submitted,

DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP

6/14/07



Paul K Tomita
Registration No. 43,196